

REMARKS

With the above Amendment, the pending claims are claims 1, 3-4, 7-8 and 10-11. In the Office Action of November 1, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock* (U.S. Patent No. 3,600,917) in view of either one of *Feng* (U.S. Patent No. 4,679,282) or *Krauss* (U.S. Patent No. 5,590,444). Further the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock* in view of either one of *Feng* or *Krauss*, and further in view of *Isenmann* patent (U.S. Patent No. 3,979,934). The Examiner suggested claims 9-11 as being allowable if written in independent form and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Especially, the Examiner asserted that the term "a front surface of the front surface" in claim 1 is unclear in context and the term lacks antecedent basis.

As shown above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim 1 is sufficiently definite and the remaining claims are also definite in view of the amended claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock* in view of either one of *Feng* or *Krauss* patents. Regarding

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
[www.finnegan.com](http://www.finnegan.com)

claim 8, the Examiner rejected the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock* in view of either one of *Feng* or *Krauss*, and further in view of *Isenmann*.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because neither the *Krock*, *Feng*, *Krauss*, nor *Isenmann* patents at least disclose or suggest "A buckle comprising a female body formed with a flat housing and a male body having flexible insertion legs which are engaged with each other by insertion, each of the female body and the male body having a front surface, a rear surface, and right and left side faces, and having butting portions including straight portions and a concave portion or a convex portion, which formed on at least the front surface of each of the female body and the male body when the female body engages with the male body, wherein the concave portion or the convex portion is formed at a center of the butting portions sandwiched by the straight portions, the convex portion in the butting portions protrudes in a trapezoidal form in which a front end is slightly narrowed, which the concave portion is concavely dented with the inlet expanded, and the male body are thereby formed closely in contact at the butting portions" as set forth in Applicants' amended claim 1.

Specifically, the Examiner argues that *Feng* suggests the use of a trapezoidal butting guide. However, the structure identified by the Examiner does not butt together. Instead, the male portion slides into the female portion. In addition, the concave and convex portions are not located on a front surface of the female or male members. Regarding *Krauss*, the butting portions are located on the side faces and not the front surface as required by the claims. Neither *Isenmann* nor *Krock* cure these deficiencies.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
[www.finnegan.com](http://www.finnegan.com)

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious over these patents cited by the Examiner, because claims 3, 4, and 7-8 depend from claim 1, these claims also be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 1, 2003

By:

  
Barry D. Biddle  
Reg. No. 44,033

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com